



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,280	02/05/2001	Masato Yonezawa	07977/264001/US4594	3403

7590

02/06/2002

SCOTT C. HARRIS
Fish & Richardson P.C.
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122

EXAMINER

ALEJANDRO MULERO, LUZ L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1763

6

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicant(s)

09/777,280

Applicant(s)

YONEZAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Luz L. Alejandro

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Pri rity

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: reference numbers 113 (fig. 1A); 202 (fig. 2A); 203 (figs. 2A and 2B); 205 (fig. 2B); 603 and 605 (fig. 6A); 701, 703, 704, 705, 707, 708, and 709 (figs. 7A and 7B); 702 and 706 (fig. 7A). A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Once a limitation is introduced in a claim, subsequent use of that limitation must use either -- the -- or -- said --, or be appropriately differentiated to represent a different limitation, note the phrase "a flexible substrate" in claims 1 and 3, line 2 and 3, respectively; the phrase "A device" in claim 2 -- line 1; and the phrase "An apparatus" in claims 4-7, line 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al., U.S. Patent 5,314,539.

Brown et al. shows the invention as claimed including a conveyor device for a flexible substrate M, said conveyor device comprising: a conveying means for continuously conveying a flexible substrate from one end to the other end; a plurality of cylindrical rollers 11, 13, 18, being provided between the one end and the other end along an arc with a radius R (see fig. 7); wherein center axes of the plurality of cylindrical rollers run parallel to each other; and a mechanism 10 for conveying the flexible substrate while the substrate is in contact with each of the plurality of cylindrical rollers (see col. 7-line 10 -- col. 8-line 64, and fig. 7).

Furthermore, with respect to claim 5, there is shown a vacuum chamber 3, and an introducing means G for introducing a gas into the vacuum chamber (see col. 11-line 66 – col.12-line 35); a gas evacuation means 49; and an energy supplying means 52 for supplying an energy to make a plasma from the gas (see col.12-lines 42-46). Also, note that plasma electrode 53 can be connected to a RF power supply which will initiate an electromagnetic wave (see col. 13-lines 8-14).

With respect to the above plasma apparatus being a plasma CVD apparatus, such limitation is directed to a method limitation instead of an apparatus limitation, and since an apparatus is being claimed as the instant invention, the method teachings are not considered to be the matter at hand since a variety of methods can be done with the apparatus. The method limitations are viewed as intended uses that do not further limit, and therefore do not patentably distinguish the claimed invention. The apparatus of Brown et al. is capable of performing different plasma processes including chemical vapor deposition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1763

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al., U.S. Patent 5,314,539.

Brown et al. is applied as above but lacks anticipation of the radius of the arc being in a range from 0.5 to 10 meters. Absent a showing of unexpected results, the relative radius of the arc would be a function of routine experimentation and would not lend patentability to the claimed invention. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to optimize the radius of the arc as claimed because in such a way a smaller radius would reduce the size of the overall apparatus thus reducing the amount of occupied space, and a larger radius would allow for more processing to be conducted in the apparatus which would lead to higher quality products with increased throughputs.

Art Unit: 1763


Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Felts et al., U.S. Patent 5,224,441 is cited to show the state of the art in plasma process apparatuses.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luz L. Alejandro whose telephone number is 703-305-4545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills can be reached on 703-308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


Luz L. Alejandro
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1763

February 4, 2002